



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/547,294	04/11/2000	Glen Sharp	SYMA-01043USOMCF/SES	4987
23910	7590	11/17/2003	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP			WANG, LIANG CHE A	
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 400			2155	12
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/547,294	SHARP ET AL
	Examiner Liang-che Alex Wang	Art Unit 2155
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Peri d for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 October 2003</u> .		
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disp sition of Claims		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are rejected.		
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.		
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachment(s)		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____		
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DynamicAccess® Technology, 3COM Technical Paper, hereinafter DynamicAccess in views of Davis et al., US Patent Number 5,937,160 hereinafter Davis.
4. Referring to claim 1, DynamicAccess has taught a method for updating a configuration specification of a computer, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. receiving a configuration file from administrator (page 10, col. 1, lines 29-30) containing location settings (page 10, col. 1, lines 17-22);- b. writing location values corresponding to the location settings into the configuration specification of the computer (page 10, col. 1, lines 1-33.)

DynamicAccess however has not explicitly taught the configuration is sent to the user through e-mail.

However, Davis has explicitly taught that any non-text file could be included with an e-mail message as attachment. (Col 12, lines 43-50.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the main purpose of the invention is to allow the administrator to send configuration file to the client's computer. And using e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to send file from one computer to another.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an e-mail containing location settings encoded in an attachment, and let the user to receive the e-mail and to have the user's computer configured by opening the attachment as taught by Davis, because e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to communicating files between computers.

5. Referring to claim 2, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 1, DynamicAccess in views of Davis had further included the configuration includes a destination of a location name corresponding to the configuration specification (page 10, configuration sending from the administrator to the remote site must contain the destination for the location name corresponding to the configuration specification, otherwise the invention would not work for its purpose;) and wherein configuration specification of the computer corresponds to the location name. (page 1, the configuration is set by the administrator for a particular computer at a particular location so the client could work properly at the location and it is the whole purpose of DynamicAccess's invention, therefore the configuration specification of the computer must corresponds to the location name.)
6. Referring to claim 3, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 1, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings are

generically defined so as to apply to a variety of operating systems. (Page 10, col. 2, lines 41-47; DynamicAccess could be used on a variety of operating system.)

7. Referring to claim 4, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 3, DynamicAccess has further taught determining an operating system type for the computer; and generating the location values by interpreting the location settings for the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10, paragraph 18 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating systems, therefore when the configuration file is sent from the administrator to the client, the operating system must be determined, and the location values must be generated by interpreting the location settings for the operating system type for the computer, so the location settings for this particular operating system could be configured into this particular computer.)
8. Referring to claim 5, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 4, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the interpreting step is performed by referring to program logic which translates the location settings into location values as a function of the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10, paragraphs 19 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating systems, and there must have program logic to translate the location settings into location values for the computer.)
9. Referring to claim 6, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify Internet settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

10. Referring to claim 7, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify an internet protocol address, a domain name server configuration, a gateway and a WINS configuration. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
11. Referring to claim 8, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify dialing settings or local area network settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
12. Referring to claim 9, DynamicAccess has taught a method for providing user's client computer with configuration settings, the method comprising the steps of:
 - a. specifying a location name for the user's client computer (page 10, col 1, lines 17-33, the location name must be specified, since the location setting is provided for this specific location;)
 - b. specifying location settings corresponding to the location name (page 10, col 1, lines 17-33;)
 - c. sending the configuration to the user (page 10, col 1, lines 4-8.)

DynamicAccess however has not explicitly taught the configuration is sent to the user through e-mail.

However, Davis has explicitly taught that any non-text file could be included with an e-mail message as attachment. (Col 12, lines 43-45.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the main purpose of the invention is to allow the administrator to send configuration file to the client's

computer. And e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to send file from one computer to another.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create an e-mail containing location settings encoded in an attachment, and send the e-mail and to the user as taught by Davis, because e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to communicating files between computers.

13. Referring to claim 10, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 9, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings are generically defined so as to apply to a variety of operating systems. (Page 10, col. 2, lines 41-47; DynamicAccess could be used on a variety of operating system.)
14. Referring to claim 11, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify Internet settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
15. Referring to claim 12, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify an internet protocol address, a domain name server configuration, a gateway and a WINS configuration. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
16. Referring to claim 13, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify dialing settings or local area network settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

17. Referring to Claims 14-21, Claims 14-21 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the Claims 1-8. Therefore, the Claims 14-21 are rejected for the same reason as the Claims 1-8.
18. Referring to Claims 22-26, Claims 22-26 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the Claims 9-13. Therefore, the Claims 22-26 are rejected for the same reason as the Claims 9-13.
19. Claims 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DynamicAccess® Technology, 3COM Technical Paper, hereinafter DynamicAccess in view of Davis et al., US Patent Number 5,937,160 hereinafter Davis, in further view of Lennert et al., US Patent Number 6,055,227, hereinafter Lennert.
20. Referring to claim 27, DynamicAccess has taught a method for updating a configuration specification of a computer, the method comprising the steps of:
 - a. receiving a configuration file from administrator (page 10, col. 1, lines 29-30) containing location settings (page 10, col. 1, lines 17-22);
 - b. writing location values corresponding to the location settings into the configuration specification of the computer (page 10, col. 1, lines 1-33.)

DynamicAccess however has not explicitly taught the configuration is sent to the user through e-mail.

However, Davis has explicitly taught that any non-text file could be included with an e-mail message as attachment. (Col 12, lines 43-50.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the main purpose of the invention is to allow the administrator to send configuration file to the client's

computer. And using e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to send file from one computer to another.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an e-mail containing location settings encoded in an attachment, and let the user to receive the e-mail and to have the user's computer configured by opening the attachment as taught by Davis, because e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to communicating files between computers.

Furthermore, DynamicAccess in view of Davis has not taught wherein the location settings are selectable during computer startup by the user.

However, Lennert has taught when user would like to select a network configuration engineering feature, user is required to select the location of the new network configuration database (Col 9 lines 56-58.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that since the configuration setting of DynamicAccess is dynamic. Multiple configurations must be presented for different location. And it is required to select one particular configuration in order to connect user's computer to the network, without setting a particular configuration will cause the system non-functional, therefore a method for setting a particular configuration is required and Lennert has taught a user selecting the location of a new configuration before accessing the new configuration. And selecting the location before use is viewed as selection during computer startup.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have wherein the location settings are selectable during

computer startup by the user, because a location selection for the new configuration is required as taught by Lennert.

21. Referring to claim 28, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 27, DynamicAccess in views of Davis had further included the configuration includes a destination of a location name corresponding to the configuration specification (page 10, configuration sending from the administrator to the remote site must contain the destination for the location name corresponding to the configuration specification, otherwise the invention would not work for its purpose;) and wherein configuration specification of the computer corresponds to the location name. (page 1, the configuration is set by the administrator for a particular computer at a particular location so the client could work properly at the location and it is the whole purpose of DynamicAccess's invention, therefore the configuration specification of the computer must corresponds to the location name.)
22. Referring to claim 29, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 27, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings are generically defined so as to apply to a variety of operating systems. (Page 10, col. 2, lines 41-47; DynamicAccess could be used on a variety of operating system.)
23. Referring to claim 30, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 29, DynamicAccess has further taught determining an operating system type for the computer; and generating the location values by interpreting the location settings for the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10, paragraph 18 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating systems,

therefore when the configuration file is sent from the administrator to the client, the operating system must be determined, and the location values must be generated by interpreting the location settings for the operating system type for the computer, so the location settings for this particular operating system could be configured into this particular computer.)

24. Referring to claim 31, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 30, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the interpreting step is performed by referring to program logic which translates the location settings into location values as a function of the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10, paragraphs 19 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating systems, and there must have been program logic to translate the location settings into location values for the computer.)
25. Referring to claim 32, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 31, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify Internet settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
26. Referring to claim 33, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 31, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify an internet protocol address, a domain name server configuration, a gateway and a WINS configuration. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)
27. Referring to claim 34, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 31, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify dialing settings or local area network settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/03, paper number 11, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

- a. That: "Claims 1-26 are believed to be allowable since they are believed to be no suggestion to combine the Davis et al., and Dynamic Access Technology references. The Davis et al., and Dynamic Access Technology refer to two different types of software.... Since these references deal with two different types of software applications, it would not be obvious to combine these references to produce the present claimed invention" on page 7.

This is found not persuasive because In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Dynamic Access Technology has taught most of the limitation of applicant's invention except the limitation of configuration file is sent to an user through an e-mail as an attachment. And Davis provides the teaching of any non-text file can be attached

in a e-mail and send to a user. Davis does not necessarily teach all the configuration part of the invention since Dynamic Access Technology has already taught it. A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to send non-text files with includes the configuration file through e-mail, since it is known in the art to transfer non-text files through e-mail attachments as taught by Davis. Furthermore, DynamicAccess has also stated on page 10 lines 22-27, that he configuration can be distributed over the network or by e-mail as a single icon for each configuration.

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
31. Saito et al., US Patent Number 6,480,889, has taught a scheme for managing nodes connected to a home network according to their physical location.
32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (703) 305-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

33. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on (703)308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communications.

34. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Liang-che Alex Wang *Liu*
November 5th, 2003



Patrice Winder
PATRICE WINDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER